

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/611,518	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carl Colin	2136	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Carl Colin.

(3) _____.

 (2) Michael J. Musella.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 October 2007
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Double Patenting rejection and 103 rejection

Claims discussed:

1, 21, 54, 59, and 65

Prior art documents discussed:

Dahlman 6,339,646
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:


See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner discussed the double patenting rejection and the 103 rejection and pointed out to Applicant's Representative, Michael Musella, discrepancies in the specification and in claims 59 and 65. Applicant's Representative clarified the differences between the invention and the prior art. Applicant's Representative authorized the Examiner to amend the specification and the claims by Examiner's amendment.


KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER